

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 485

EA 018 056

TITLE District Selection and Assessment of Educational Personnel. A Study to Assess the Quality of the Preparation and Performance of Education Personnel: Study Report No. 1.

INSTITUTION Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Dept. of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

PUB DATE 82

NOTE 38p.; For related documents, see EA 018 057-058.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Evaluation; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Employment Practices; Inservice Education; *Personnel Evaluation; *Personnel Management; *Personnel Policy; Personnel Selection; Questionnaires; Recruitment; Surveys; Teacher Evaluation

IDENTIFIERS Illinois; Illinois State Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This is the first of three technical reports that focus on the hiring and evaluation of educational personnel in Illinois. It summarizes the findings of a survey conducted in the spring of 1982 to obtain information about the recruitment, selection, retention, an evaluation of prospective teachers in Illinois public schools. A questionnaire was sent to a stratified random sample of Illinois school districts based on the type, size, and geographic location of the districts. The survey questions and results are presented in the same order as they were presented in the questionnaire: (1) recruitment, (2) selection, and (3) evaluation. Findings suggest that local district personnel generally do not recruit widely or vigorously even though recruitment efforts may be hampered by competitive salaries in other districts, geographic preferences, inadequate supply of candidates, or unique district needs. Selection criteria and procedures are frequently not formalized. Districts rely heavily on references and academic record, but the candidate's willingness to accept extracurricular assignments or ability to teach in more than one area are also pertinent. Evaluation procedures in most districts are formalized for teachers, but seldom for other educational personnel. A larger than expected percentage of districts report that unsatisfactory evaluations result in personnel actions including dismissal. Results are also reported for open-ended questions to district personnel on constraints that prevented them from realizing their recruitment, selection, and evaluation goals, and on inservice practices. An appendix provides tables showing response percentages for each item on the questionnaire. (TE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

EA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Leonardo A.
Bartolini*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Study to Assess the Quality
of the Preparation and Performance of Education Personnel

Study Report #1

DISTRICT SELECTION AND ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Edward Copeland, Chairperson
State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

Department of Planning, Research, and Evaluation

Springfield, Illinois

Fall, 1982

ED262485

EA 018 056

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
PROCEDURES	3
FINDINGS	3
Recruitment	3
Selection	4
Evaluation	7
Open-Ended Responses: Constraints	9
Open-Ended Responses: Inservice	11
SUMMARY	11
APPENDIX A: TABLES	13

INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of the findings of a survey conducted in the spring of 1982. It is one of three technical reports which focus on the recruitment, selection, retention, and assessment practices employed in Illinois during the preparation, hiring, and evaluation of educational personnel. Statewide information will be used to identify issues regarding the quality of the preparation and performance of educational personnel. Local district selection and assessment practices are presented in this report.

BACKGROUND

Ten years ago, when there was little disagreement over the fact that supply of teachers was greater than demand for teachers, in almost all subject areas and in most geographic regions, it was not uncommon to hear the view that this situation provided a golden opportunity to improve education. Schools of education could raise standards and be more selective about the teacher candidates admitted to professional preparation programs. Likewise, local district administrators could choose the "most qualified" candidate from a relatively large pool of candidates. What was particularly interesting about these proposals to improve education was that they were made at a time when, relatively speaking, there was little dissatisfaction with the overall quality of education.

Perceptions regarding the quality of education, as well as the supply/demand balance of educational personnel have changed. Illinois in particular has experienced a steady decrease in both the demand for teachers and the supply of newly prepared personnel. For the most part, however, supply has decreased faster than demand. The current supply/demand balance is viewed by many local district administrators to be insufficient for them to find "qualified" candidates. On the other hand, Deans of Education are concerned that decreased enrollment in some teacher education programs may not be sufficient to justify continuation of the programs. Opportunities to improve education by raising standards and selecting applicants, for many are perceived to no longer exist. Rather, the problem is perceived by some to be one of recruiting prospective teachers, both at the college level and the local district level, in order to meet program needs.

Changing supply and demand is not the only reason, and perhaps not a primary reason, there is now much greater concern about the quality of education in our schools. Declining student aptitude and achievement scores, stories about children graduating who are not able to read, general concern in times of restricted budgets that one is not getting "his or her dollar's worth," have all contributed to increased attention, by both the public in general and among educational professionals, to the quality of education.

Given this gradual change in the perceptions regarding the quality of education, the Illinois State Board of Education has consistently and persistently taken action designed to improve the preparation of education personnel. Since 1975, the State Board of Education has: (1) adopted a set of standards and criteria to be used in the review of teacher educational institutions and their programs; (2) supported legislation which became effective July 1, 1981, requiring all applicants for certificates to

complete approved programs; (3) periodically reviewed the supply of professional educators, urged institutions to improve the quality of preparatory programs, and monitored the quality of these programs through a continuing review system; (4) adopted a policy to work closely with the Illinois Board of Higher Education in the approval of new preparation programs; and (5) adopted requirements for increased field experiences as a part of all professional preparation programs.

Legislators and representatives of professional education associations have also expressed general concern about the quality of education in Illinois. Following the examples of other states, proposals have been introduced and/or debated which would require minimum competency tests for graduation from high school. Other proposals would require proficiency exams for prospective teachers. Among the pool of proposals and counterproposals, questions regarding the recruitment and selection practices of colleges of education in Illinois continue to be raised. In addition, local district selection and retention practices have been identified as needing review.

There is general agreement among those concerned with the quality of education in Illinois that recruitment, selection, retention, and evaluation practices, at both the college or university level and the local district level, will affect the quality of educational personnel. There is less agreement on exactly how these factors affect quality. It is also generally assumed that Illinois institutions of higher education and local districts have developed diverse and varied practices in recruiting, selecting, and assessing educational personnel. Yet, there is little available information from a comprehensive, statewide perspective on what, in fact, constitutes common practices.

Given the current level of concern about the quality of education in Illinois as well as the scarcity of information about current recruitment, selection, and retention practices, the Illinois State Board of Education adopted a proposal in July of 1981 directing its staff to conduct a series of studies which would address some of these relevant issues. That proposal, in part, read as follows:

The State Board of Education in one of its goal statements has committed itself to periodic review of "teacher education/certification standards compatible with educational needs." Such a review is timely in light of present concerns regarding the preparation and performance of certificated personnel. There are four major issues for which further examination and study should provide the Board information and data upon which to consider additional policy on teacher education, certification and assessment of educational professionals. They are:

- 1) What are Illinois institutions currently doing to assess the quality of teacher, school service personnel, and administrator graduates? What are the recruitment, selection, retention and evaluation criteria used by institutions?
- 2) What criteria are local school districts using in selecting staff? Do the selection criteria indicate needs for staff not addressed in preparation programs?

- 3) What are the constraints on institutions and school districts which may affect recruitment into the field of education, selection of staff, and improvement of staff skills?
- 4) What are the experiences of other states in using assessment instruments and what potential does assessment prior to certification have for Illinois?

Three separate surveys were conducted in the spring of 1982 in an effort to answer, in part, the questions raised in the proposal. First, a survey of local district practices was conducted. The purpose of this survey was to obtain information about the recruitment, selection, retention, and evaluation of prospective teachers in Illinois public schools. Second, survey questionnaires were sent to persons responsible for the preparation of professional education personnel at colleges and universities, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The purpose of these surveys was to verify and obtain information about the recruitment, selection, retention, and evaluation of prospective teachers in Illinois public and nonpublic colleges and universities. Since it was recognized that recruitment and selection practices would differ for undergraduates and graduates, two separate questionnaires were developed, one for each level.

PROCEDURES

Available literature suggests that practices employed by local districts in the selection and assessment of educational personnel might vary from district to district, but that a number of procedures were commonly followed. Based upon commonly held views a draft questionnaire was developed which was then shared with local district personnel directors for their review and comment. Once revised, the questionnaire was sent to a stratified random sample of Illinois school districts based on type, size, and geographic location of the districts. Over ninety percent of the surveys were completed and returned, including surveys from districts considered to be crucial to the study (e.g., District #299, City of Chicago). Based upon this high rate of return, findings reported are considered to be a relatively accurate representation of practices statewide. Data presented reflect information obtained and analyzed from 255 completed survey instruments.

FINDINGS

The survey instrument sent to local school districts was divided into three parts: (1) Recruitment, (2) Selection, and (3) Evaluation. Tables which show both the questions asked and the responses are provided in the Appendix of this report. The survey questions and results are presented in exactly the same order they were presented in the study questionnaire.

Recruitment

Four questions regarding recruitment practices at the school district level were asked. The first requested that the five practices used most frequently to create a pool of candidates for teacher and school service personnel positions be identified and ranked (See Table I-1.) Checking the file of current applicants and sending announcements to teacher education

institutions were the two most widely used practices. Over 96 percent of the respondents indicated the first choice and almost 93 percent the second. Almost two-thirds of the respondents (65.1 percent) indicated that they make informal contacts with representatives of teacher education institutions, but this practice was frequently ranked 3rd, 4th, or 5th. Just over half of the districts indicated that other Illinois school districts were contacted regarding personnel available as a result of RIF. Less than 6 percent indicated that they recruit nation-wide.

When routine practices did not generate a pool of candidates, over half of the districts (54.5 percent) indicated that experienced individuals who left the profession were actively sought (See Table I-2). A third of the respondents indicated that they recruited staff of other school districts under these circumstances. Whether respondents meant they actually "raid" other districts is not clear, but this is certainly implied. Less than a third (30.2 percent) of the respondents indicated that they utilize contacts with non-Illinois schools regarding personnel available as a result of RIF.

Recruitment of minority candidates beyond routine practices is not widespread. (See Table I-3.) Less than a quarter of the respondents indicated that any special practices were employed. The most frequent practice checked, using published lists of available qualified minority personnel, was used by 22.4 percent of the districts. A number of respondents however indicated that no special recruiting efforts were required in their districts.

The fourth question on recruitment asked respondents to rank the three factors which most constrain recruitment of qualified personnel in their districts. (See Table I-4.) Slightly over half indicated that the two factors which most constrain recruitment were: (1) Salaries were better in other Illinois school districts (55.9 percent), and (2) Candidates have other geographic preferences (54.9 percent.) Just over 40 percent of the respondents indicated that supply was inadequate (40.8 percent) but these respondents almost always ranked this factor first or second. Just under 40 percent (38.0 percent) indicated that district requirements (that candidates qualify for multiple roles) were a constraining factor.

In summary, widespread use of recruiting practices beyond two or three commonly employed (checking the file, sending announcements to teacher education institutions, or making informal contacts) is not evident among Illinois school districts. In addition, it is not common for school district personnel to go beyond routine practices to recruit candidates when they are not available, although in over half of the districts, former, experienced personnel are sought. Special efforts made to recruit minority candidates is not obvious among Illinois school districts, but district personnel may not believe that special practices are needed. Finally, competitive salaries in other districts, geographic preferences of candidates, inadequate supply of candidates, and unique district needs are identified most frequently as factors which constrain recruitment.

Selection

Survey respondents were asked a number of questions about district practices and criteria used in the selection of educational personnel. The first, requested that statements relevant to the selection process be identified

(checked) if they were applicable to the local district. According to respondents, only half the districts in Illinois (51.0 percent) have written policies regarding the selection of new staff (See Table I-5). Almost a third (32.9 percent) have qualifications which exceed minimum requirements specified in relevant state rules and regulations, including State Board of Education Document 1. Only 29.0 percent indicated that their districts had fully developed job descriptions. Finally, 4.3 percent indicated that the district required candidates to take qualifying tests. In a sample of 255 districts, 3 indicated a Teacher Perceiver test was required, 1 indicated the National Teacher Examination (NTE) was used, 4 used district prepared examinations, and 5 indicated that other types of tests were used.

District superintendents and principals are the persons most involved in the selection of Illinois teachers. (See Table I-6, Part A.) It was indicated that superintendents participate in the selection process in 83.9 percent of the districts. In 79.6 percent of the districts principals participate in the selection of teachers. In well over a third of the districts (38.8 percent), school board members are actively involved, but not necessarily in a major way. Over half of the respondents indicating that school board members were involved ranked them third. Associate or Assistant Superintendents are active in the selection of teachers in 28.2 percent of the districts.

The type of person who participates in the selection of school service personnel parallels the pattern identified for school teachers. (See Table I-6, Part B.) Superintendents, principals, and school board members are most involved in the selection of school service personnel. School administrators, on the other hand, are almost always selected by superintendents or school board members (See Table I-6, Part C) although respondents in about one third of the districts, 32.7 percent, indicated that principals were involved as well.

When selecting teacher candidates, district personnel rely heavily on a few major sources of information, although the items of most importance shift slightly when selecting experienced candidates rather than inexperienced candidates (See Tables I-7, Part A and I-7, Part B.) When selecting inexperienced candidates, references of professors or student-teacher supervisors outrank academic record in order of importance, although these two items are the major considerations and are used by almost all districts. A strong third consideration, however, is the willingness and/or ability of the candidate to accept extracurricular assignments.

When selecting experienced candidates, references from school administrators are used by most districts (91.0 percent) as either the first or second consideration. Next in importance is full-time teaching experience followed by the candidate's academic record. Willingness and/or ability to accept extracurricular assignments was also considered by over half the districts, followed closely by references of professors or student-teacher supervisors. Less than half the districts reported using other identified items for consideration.

Survey respondents were asked to indicate, in rank order, what information was sought during an interview (See Table I-8.) Interviews are used by a very high percentage of district personnel to determine commitment to

teaching (95.3 percent), appearance and poise (94.5 percent), knowledge of teaching field (92.9 percent), professional judgment (91.0 percent), and oral skills and understanding of one's role (89.4 percent and 85.1 percent respectively.) Commitment to teaching and knowledge of field appear to outrank other items, although appearance and poise is a close third.

Academic records, while they may not be the first consideration when selecting candidates, are used first to determine whether a candidate has specific courses or training in specific areas. (See Table I-9.) Next, academic records are used to determine whether candidates meet minimal course qualifications. Grade point averages (overall and in one's major) are next in importance. About two-thirds of the respondents also indicated that grade point averages in professional education or in English, mathematics and science are also reviewed.

Other than a candidate's academic record, application materials are the only other major source of information used by most district personnel to assess a candidate's writing skills and abilities. Just over two-thirds of the respondents (68.6 percent) indicated that application materials were used for this purpose. (See Table I-10.) Special essays or additional writing material are used in a very small percentage of districts.

A final question on the selection process used in local districts asked respondents to indicate how frequently they routinely select applicants who are certified to teach in more than one area over those prepared to teach in a single area or at a single level. (See Table I-11.) In over half the districts (58.0 percent) candidates certificated to teach in more than one area are frequently chosen over those not so certified. In an additional 10.2 percent of the districts, candidates with multiple areas of preparation are always chosen over those without multiple certification.

Most practices identified by local district personnel in the selection of candidates were not surprising. Only half the districts in Illinois have written policies regarding the selection of educational personnel. Fewer, about one-third, have qualifications beyond the minimum required by regulation or have fully developed job descriptions. Except when selecting administrators, superintendents and principals are the personnel most responsible for selecting teachers and school service personnel.

When selecting candidates, references of professors or student-teacher supervisors and academic records are relied upon heavily. A third, important consideration, however, is the willingness and/or ability of candidates to accept extracurricular assignments. Interviews, as expected, are used to review or determine a candidate's commitment, knowledge of teaching field, and to make a judgment about the candidate's appearance and poise. Academic records are used to determine whether a candidate is qualified to fill a given position. Little else other than one's academic record and application materials, however, are used to assess a candidate's writing or communication skills. In support of the contention that candidates prepared to teach in more than one area are more marketable than those who are not, 68.2 percent of the respondents indicated that candidates prepared in multiple areas are frequently or always chosen over others.

Evaluation

Evaluation practices implemented in local school districts may have an important effect on the quality of education. To learn more about how evaluation was conducted, therefore, a series of questions were asked which focused upon those who had responsibility for evaluation, whether written standards and written criteria were used, and how criteria were determined. In addition, questions regarding follow-up practices for those receiving unsatisfactory evaluations were posed.

The first question on evaluation asked respondents to identify the persons responsible for evaluating the performance of those holding specific educational positions. (See Table I-12.) As expected, superintendents, in practically all districts, are evaluated by local school boards. There was some evidence, however, that in as many as 15.7 percent of the districts, self evaluations by the superintendent are part of the process. Assistant superintendents and personnel directors are evaluated, for the most part, by superintendents, but school board members are involved in 16.5 percent of the districts. This same pattern of evaluations was evident for principals, supervisors, and coordinators, although assistant superintendents took part in this process in over 18 percent of the districts.

Teachers, as expected, are evaluated primarily by principals, but superintendents, in approximately half of the districts, become involved in the evaluations of teachers. School service personnel, in a large percentage of districts, are also evaluated by principals, but superintendents take part in approximately one third of the districts and department heads or coordinators also participate in 12 percent to 15 percent of the districts.

In almost 75 percent of the districts, standardized evaluation instruments are used when evaluating teachers, whether probationary or not. (See Table I-13.) This practice falls off considerably for other categories of personnel, however. Standardized evaluation instruments are used in less than half of the districts (48.2 percent) to evaluate guidance counselors, and are used in 25 percent to 40 percent of the districts to evaluate all other categories of educational personnel except assistant or associate superintendents. Standardized instruments are used in only 14.5 percent of the districts when evaluating this last group of personnel.

District respondents were also asked about the use of written criteria in the evaluating of staff. (See Table I-14.) Responses followed the same pattern evident when reporting on the use of standardized instruments. Written criteria are used in almost 80 percent of the districts to evaluate teachers. Use of written criteria was reported used by approximately 50 percent of the districts when evaluating administrators and guidance counselors, except for assistant or associate superintendents for which only 24 percent of the districts reported the use of written criteria. Written criteria were used in approximately one-third of the districts to evaluate school service personnel other than counselors.

As a follow-up question on the use of written criteria, respondents were asked to indicate who had the responsibility for determining the written criteria. (See Table I-15.) Administrative committees, the evaluator and evaluatee, in consultation, and local board leadership were identified as

the personnel with primary responsibility for determining written criteria for administrators, but none of these groups was identified by more than 40 percent of the districts. Administrative committees and the evaluator and evaluatee, in consultation, were also identified by just over 40 percent of the districts as the personnel with primary responsibility for determining written criteria for teachers. In about 24 percent of the districts, board members and other committees were also identified as having some responsibility for criteria used when evaluating teachers. These same groups, but to a somewhat lesser extent, were identified as having responsibility for written evaluation criteria used for school service personnel.

A final question on the use of evaluation criteria asked respondents to identify the types of criteria used. (See Table I-16.) It was clear that when evaluating administrators, professional competence and professional attitude were the two criteria most frequently checked (84.3 percent for both criteria.) These were followed somewhat closely by personal relations with parents (76.5 percent), appearance and poise (73 percent) and personal relations with peers (70.2 percent). Other criteria were used by a relatively small percentage of district personnel. These same criteria were identified for use when evaluating teachers and school service personnel, although student performance was identified by a relatively high percentage of districts (58.8 percent) as a criterion used to evaluate teachers.

A number of actions can be taken by local district personnel if an evaluation indicates that a staff member's performance is unsatisfactory. The action identified by most districts (91.8 percent for tenured staff and 79.6 percent for non-tenured staff) was to develop a written plan for remediation. (See Table I-17.) From 73 percent to 80 percent of the districts also indicated that more frequent evaluations and scheduling of periodic conferences with supervisors were also employed. Close to half of the districts (51.4 percent for tenured staff and 47.1 percent for non-tenured staff) also recommended or required participation in in-service programs. In addition, over 43 percent of the districts indicated that dismissal was an action taken for unsatisfactory performance. This percentage jumped to 74.5 percent for non-tenured staff.

Additional questions required that respondents provide data on the number of staff who left because of unsatisfactory performance. (See Table I-18.) Specifically, district personnel were asked to provide the number of persons dismissed in the last two years because of unsatisfactory performance. Almost 11 percent of the districts indicated that teachers on continued contractual service left for this reason. Close to 40 percent of the districts indicated that probationary teachers were dismissed because of unsatisfactory performance. Approximately 7 percent and 11 percent indicated that principals and school service personnel, respectively, were dismissed for unsatisfactory performance. The mean number of persons dismissed by these districts over the last two years ranged from 1.1 for principals to 3.4 for school service personnel.

About the same percentage of districts reported that probationary teachers, principals, and school service personnel left, in part, because of unsatisfactory performance even though they were not dismissed. Considerably more districts, 28.2 percent, reported that teachers on continued contractual service left under these circumstances. The mean

number of staff leaving in these districts ranged from .2 for principals to 1.8 for teachers. A relatively small percentage of districts reported that staff were granted a third year of probationary status except in the case of probationary teachers. For these staff 16.5 percent reported that a third year was granted.

District personnel were further requested to indicate how many teachers, administrators, and school service personnel were hired during 1981-82. (See Table I-19.) Over 70 percent reported that inexperienced teachers were hired. The mean number hired was 4.3. Approximately 16 percent indicated that inexperienced administrators were hired. The mean for this group was 1.9. Over 25 percent reported that inexperienced school service personnel were hired. An average of 1.8 school service personnel were reported hired. Approximately the same percentage of districts reported that experienced staff were hired in all three categories of personnel. The mean number of experienced teachers hired, however, was 7.1. The mean number of experienced administrators hired was about the same as for inexperienced administrators, 1.8. The average number of experienced school service personnel hired was very high, 22.3. This figure, however, was skewed by the fact that one large district reported that a very large number of persons were hired.

In summary, findings regarding the evaluation of personnel in local districts frequently followed expected patterns. School board members are responsible for evaluating superintendents, and principals are primarily responsible for evaluating all other personnel except assistant superintendents, who are evaluated by superintendents. Standardized evaluation instruments and written criteria are used in a very large percentage of districts to evaluate teachers. Use of standardized evaluation instruments and written criteria is not widespread when evaluating other educational personnel. When written criteria are used, administrative committees, the evaluator and evaluatee, in consultation, and local board leadership were identified as having primary responsibility for determining the criteria. Major criteria used to evaluate educational personnel include professional competence and attitude, personal relations with parents and peers, appearance and poise, and to some extent for teachers, student performance.

When personnel do receive unsatisfactory evaluations, plans for remediation, more frequent evaluations, conferences with supervisors, and required in-service programs are all actions employed in local districts. Dismissal, as an action employed for unsatisfactory performance, was also identified by a relatively high percentage of districts. In practice however, few districts reported that personnel other than probationary teachers were actually dismissed because of unsatisfactory performance, although it was not uncommon for staff to leave, in part, because of unsatisfactory performance even though they were not dismissed.

Open-Ended Responses: Constraints

Survey respondents were provided an opportunity to further develop some of their answers to structured questions by the addition of open ended questions. Specifically, district personnel were asked to identify and discuss the constraints that prevented them from effectively realizing their goals in the areas of recruitment, selection, and evaluation. Their responses echoed those provided to the more formal questions.

Of the 255 districts returning questionnaires, approximately 30 percent did not respond to the opportunity to note constraints on their efforts to recruit, select, or evaluate staff. An additional 17 percent explicitly responded that they experienced no constraints in these areas.

Of the 138 districts noting constraints in one or more areas, about 20 percent indicated they experienced no difficulty in recruitment and slightly more than 50 percent noted no constraints in the area of selection. Frequently, the responses indicated that problems were not met in these areas because districts were reducing staff and had not been hiring, or had hired only few, staff in the past two or three years. About 40 percent indicated no constraints in the area of evaluation; several of these respondents reported recent revisions in the evaluation process or that revisions were underway.

Approximately 40 percent of all respondents identified one or more constraints in the area of recruitment. The most frequently cited constraint related to salaries. Comments suggest that this constraint takes several forms: generally lower salaries for teaching as compared with other occupations; inability to pay teachers in some teaching areas more than in other areas; and differences between salaries offered in surrounding districts. Salaries were mentioned as a constraint by about 40 percent of those identifying one or more constraints in recruiting. About the same percentage also referred to the lack of candidates in specific fields, with these fields usually including science, mathematics, and industrial arts.

Of the 110 districts identifying a constraint on recruitment efforts, about 20 percent cited geographical location as a major problem. Commentary accompanying these responses referred to candidates' preferences for more urban areas, for larger districts with more course offerings, and what was represented as a less "conservative" community environment.

Over 20 percent of the districts made general comments about "time and/or money" as representing a difficulty. When more detail was provided, it usually involved the lack of personnel available to recruit actively. About 15 percent of those experiencing difficulty in recruitment referred to the constraint imposed by needs for personnel qualified in more than one area. One example of this problem mentioned by a district was a position requiring qualifications to teach French and serve as a media specialist. Several of these respondents also indicated that while available personnel qualified for teaching positions they either would not or were unqualified to assume extracurricular responsibilities, especially coaching. About 10 percent of those commenting on difficulties in recruitment referred generally to a "limited supply" of applicants. Other constraints noted included interference by school boards in the selection process and the unreliability of recommendations.

Seventy-five of the 255 respondents noted one or more constraints on selection of candidates. In general, the specific kinds of constraints on selection mirrored those noted under recruitment. The most frequently mentioned difficulties were, in order of decreasing frequency: lack of applicants qualified in specific areas; salary; geographical location, and the need for persons qualified in more than one area.

In the area of evaluation, 80 districts cited one or more constraints. The lack of time available for carrying out evaluation was mentioned by over 40 percent of these districts. Statutes regulating dismissal of tenured staff were identified as a constraint by 20 percent, failure to achieve mutual understanding between the administration and teachers about the functions of evaluation was referred to by 15 percent of those identifying a constraint in this area. The same percentage referred to a lack of expertise in the area of evaluation. Other constraints identified included restrictions on evaluation in negotiated contracts, and involvement of school board members and community pressure in the evaluation process.

Open-Ended Responses: Inservice

The portion of the survey on selection and assessment dealing with inservice practices confirms previous perceptions of the state of the art in Illinois. As a whole, efforts are uneven in quality and piecemeal, but some districts have established comprehensive systems. The major method of delivery is the workshop or institute dealing with topics ranging from computer literacy to assertive discipline. Two hundred and fifty five school districts have returned forms. Of these, 45 provided no response relating to inservice.

The mechanisms for inservice education identified most frequently are district, county, and regional workshops. Many districts provide reimbursement for college and university coursework. Also cited is work done by curriculum committees which often results in spin-off inservice activity. A few districts have begun comprehensive and continuous district-wide planning for inservice, and others have placed great importance on needs assessment techniques. Other innovations identified are Teacher Centers and the Illinois Centers for Educational Improvement.

The most popular topic for workshops and speakers is computer literacy, but many districts also expressed interest in special education, assertive discipline, stress and burnout, basic skills, audiovisual techniques, criterion-referenced testing, alcohol and drugs, and multicultural education.

It appears that large districts with concomitant fiscal and other resources have an easier time mounting approaches to inservice that go beyond the piecemeal; some smaller districts, however, have been working with universities to receive guidance in long-range planning. Inservice efforts reflect the diversity that is part of a large state, but there would appear to be potential for more innovative and comprehensive approaches to professional development.

SUMMARY

Informal communications with local district personnel provide some insight into the practices and problems encountered in regard to recruitment, selection, and evaluation of personnel. This study documents, in a more formal manner, the frequency and magnitude of those common practices and problems.

Generally, local district personnel do not recruit widely or vigorously even though recruitment efforts may be hampered by competitive salaries in other districts, geographic preferences of candidates, inadequate supply of candidates, or by unique district needs.

Selection procedures are frequently not formalized. Most districts have little in writing regarding qualifications or job descriptions beyond what is required by statute or regulation. References and academic record are relied upon heavily when selecting candidates, but willingness and/or ability of the candidate to accept extracurricular assignments may well be the factor used to determine whether a person is hired. As expected, candidates prepared to teach in more than one area are more marketable than those who are not.

Evaluation procedures employed in most local districts are formalized, especially in regard to teachers. Formal evaluation procedures for educational personnel other than teachers, however, are not as common. While small, a larger than expected percentage of districts report that several courses of action are implemented, including dismissal, when staff do receive unsatisfactory evaluations.

Given that many factors may affect quality of education today, the common practices and problems relevant to recruitment, selection and evaluation of staff deserve review. Action regarding these areas may have a substantial impact on the overall effort to improve education.

DLN/1510h

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table I-1

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

I. Recruitment

1. Please rank the five practices used most frequently to create a pool of candidates for teacher and school services personnel positions. (1=most frequently used.)

	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%)				
			1	2	3	4	5
a. Checking the file of current applicants	96.1	1.8	49.8	30.3	11.6	5.8	2.5
b. Placing notices in the Teacher Vacancy List maintained by the State Board of Education	23.5	3.8	3.4	18.6	11.9	27.1	39.0
c. Sending announcements to teacher education institutions	92.9	1.9	45.5	32.2	13.7	5.2	3.4
d. Making informal contacts with representatives of teacher education institutions	65.1	3.4	2.5	19.1	35.8	25.3	17.3
e. Interviewing at Illinois teacher education institutions	27.8	3.9	1.4	10.1	27.5	23.2	37.7
f. Advertising in local newspapers	29.4	3.8	2.7	18.9	16.2	24.3	37.8
g. Recruiting nation-wide	5.9	4.0	0.0	21.4	0.0	35.7	42.9
h. Hiring certificated individuals for non-professional roles such as teacher aides for potential professional positions	34.9	3.7	6.9	9.2	25.3	28.7	29.8
i. Contacting other Illinois school districts regarding personnel available as result of RIF	52.5	3.7	1.5	11.5	29.0	30.5	27.5
j. Selecting former district student teachers or interns	40.0	3.8	3.0	7.9	24.8	38.6	25.8
k. Other	22.5	3.3	25.8	9.7	12.9	16.1	35.5

Table I-2

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
2. Which of the following are employed when routine recruitment practices do not generate a pool of candidates? (Check those that apply.)	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
a. Recruit from staff of other school districts	a. 85	33.3
b. Actively seek experienced individuals who left the profession (i.e., homemakers, retirees, etc.)	b. 139	54.5
c. Utilize contacts with non-Illinois schools regarding personnel available as a result of RIF	c. 77	33.2
d. Other	d. 36	14.1

Table I-3

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
3. Which of the following practices are employed to recruit minority candidates in addition to routine recruitment methods?	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
a. Visiting teacher education institutions with significant numbers of minority students	a. 49	19.2
b. Nation-wide recruiting	b. 31	12.2
c. Using published lists of available qualified minority personnel	c. 57	22.4
d. Other	d. 47	18.4

Table I-4

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
4. Rank the three factors which most constrain recruitment of qualified personnel in your district. (1 = most restricting)	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%)				
			1	2	3	4	5
a. Salaries are better in other Illinois school districts	a. 55.9	2.0	42.7	17.9	35.9	0.9	2.6
b. Fringe benefits (insurance, sabbatical, etc.) are better in other Illinois school districts	b. 27.5	2.6	5.7	44.3	40.0	5.7	4.3
c. Candidates have other geographic preferences	c. 54.9	1.8	44.3	35.0	17.9	0.7	2.1
d. District lacks funds to recruit aggressively	d. 17.6	2.2	31.1	33.3	24.4	6.7	4.4
e. Supply of potential applicants is inadequate	e. 40.8	1.8	46.2	34.6	17.3	1.0	1.0
f. Candidates prefer non-school related occupations	f. 28.6	2.3	24.7	31.5	39.7	2.7	1.4
g. District requires candidates to qualify for multiple roles (e.g., three or more teaching areas; teaching areas and extracurricular activities)	g. 38.0	2.1	29.5	31.6	37.9	0.0	1.1
h. Other	h. 8.2	1.9	47.6	14.3	38.1	0.0	0.0

Table I-5

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

II. Selection

1. Check the following statements which apply to your district.	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
a. The district has fully developed job descriptions, including qualifications, for each position.	a. 74	29.0
b. District qualifications for positions exceed minimum requirements as specified for certification in State Board of Education Document 1 and/or in any other relevant state rules and regulations (e.g., Special Education)	b. 84	32.9
c. The district has a written policy regarding the selection of new professional staff.	c. 130	51.0
d. The district requires candidates to take qualifying test(s). If checked, indicate which test(s) are required.	d. 11	4.3

	Number and Percentage Checking Each Test	
	Number	%
1. Teacher Perceiver Test	3	1.2
2. National Teacher Examination	1	0.4
3. District prepared examinations	4	1.6
4. Achievement Test(s)	0	0.0
5. Personality Test(s)	0	0.0
6. Other	5	2.0

Table I-6, Part A

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

2. Rank those persons identified who actively participate in the selection of the following educational personnel.
(1 = most involved)

<u>Persons Participating in the Selection Process</u>	<u>Those Selected: Teaching Personnel</u>						
	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%)				
			1	2	3	4	5
a. School Board Members	a. 38.8	2.8	5.0	26.2	51.2	16.2	1.2
b. Superintendent	b. 83.9	3.2	59.9	25.4	13.4	1.4	0.0
c. Associate or Assistant Superintendent or Personnel Director	c. 28.2	1.3	50.0	36.4	9.1	2.3	2.3
d. Principal or Program Director	d. 79.6	3.5	37.8	55.1	7.1	0.0	0.0
e. Other	e. 10.6	0.6	0.0	12.5	68.8	18.8	0.0

Table I-6, Part B

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

2. Rank those persons identified who actively participate in the selection of the following educational personnel.
(1 = most involved)

<u>Persons Participating in the Selection Process</u>	<u>Those Selected: School Service Personnel</u>						
	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%)				
			1	2	3	4	5
a. School Board Members	a. 39.6	1.7	9.2	34.2	39.5	17.1	0.0
b. Superintendent	b. 82.0	3.2	68.3	18.3	12.7	0.7	0.0
c. Associate or Assistant Superintendent or Personnel Director	c. 28.2	1.2	55.3	31.9	8.5	4.3	0.0
d. Principal or Program Director	d. 67.8	2.9	25.4	57.9	16.7	0.0	0.0
e. Other	e. 7.5	0.4	8.3	33.3	50.0	8.3	0.0

Table I-6, Part C

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

2. Rank those persons identified who actively participate in the selection of the following educational personnel.
(1 = most involved)

<u>Persons Participating in the Selection Process</u>	<u>Those Selected: Administrative Personnel</u>						
	<u>Percentage Checking Response</u>	<u>Mean Rank</u>	<u>Distribution of Rankings (%)</u>				
			<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
a. School Board Members	a. 76.1	3.2	38.2	45.0	12.2	4.6	0.0
b. Superintendent	b. 86.3	3.4	78.9	20.4	0.7	0.0	0.0
c. Associate or Assistant Superintendent or Personnel Director	c. 27.8	1.4	16.7	57.1	21.4	2.4	2.4
d. Principal or Program Director	d. 32.7	1.8	7.8	31.4	49.0	11.8	0.0
e. Other	e. 3.5	2.9	14.3	14.3	57.1	0.0	14.3

Table I-7, Part A

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

2. Rank order the five most important items listed below which are used by your district in the selection of teacher candidates. (1 = most important)

	Inexperienced Candidates						
	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%)				
			1	2	3	4	5
a. Academic record	a. 82.4	2.5	22.5	34.0	23.0	12.0	8.6
b. Scores on standardized tests (see II-1 above)	b. 2.7	2.4	28.6	42.9	0.0	14.3	14.3
c. References of professors and student teaching supervisors	c. 98.2	1.8	52.3	27.0	10.4	7.2	3.2
d. Experience in non-school jobs	d. 38.8	3.8	1.0	12.5	27.1	21.9	37.5
e. Full-time teaching experience in public or private schools	e. 10.2	2.4	26.9	26.9	26.9	11.5	7.7
f. Part-time teaching experience (including substitute) in public or private schools	f. 27.8	3.0	12.9	24.3	31.4	15.7	15.7
g. References from school administrators	g. 40.8	2.9	16.7	26.5	23.5	19.6	13.7
h. Performance as teacher aide in the district	h. 17.6	3.2	20.0	15.6	13.3	31.1	20.0
i. Qualifications to hold positions other than the one in question	i. 49.8	3.7	4.0	8.7	24.6	38.1	24.6
j. Reputation of colleges and universities attended by the applicant	j. 27.8	3.7	7.1	10.0	22.9	24.3	35.7
k. Willingness and/or ability to accept extracurricular assignments	k. 61.6	4.1	0.6	8.3	17.3	32.7	41.0
l. Other	l. 16.9	2.3	50.0	14.3	14.3	4.8	16.7

Table I-7, Part B

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

2. Rank order the five most important items listed below which are used by your district in the selection of teacher candidates. (1 = most important)

	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Experienced Candidates				
			Distribution of Rankings (%)				
			1	2	3	4	5
a. Academic record	a. 71.0	3.3	12.8	15.1	25.1	26.3	20.7
b. Scores on standardized tests (see II-1 above)	b. 2.7	2.8	33.3	0.0	33.3	16.7	16.7
c. References of professors and student teaching supervisors	c. 52.2	3.5	3.1	20.0	26.9	28.5	21.5
d. Experience in non-school jobs	d. 10.2	4.8	0.0	4.0	4.0	16.0	76.0
e. Full-time teaching experience in public or private schools	e. 87.5	2.1	37.7	31.8	17.3	7.3	6.0
f. Part-time teaching experience (including substitute) in public or private schools	f. 28.2	3.2	0.0	31.0	29.6	25.4	14.1
g. References from school administrators	g. 91.0	2.0	47.2	26.6	14.0	8.3	3.9
h. Performance as teacher aide in the district	h. 11.4	3.5	3.6	21.4	25.0	25.0	25.0
i. Qualifications to hold positions other than the one in question	i. 47.1	4.0	1.8	6.4	20.9	31.8	39.1
j. Reputation of colleges and universities attended by the applicant	j. 11.8	3.9	3.4	17.2	20.7	17.2	41.3
k. Willingness and/or ability to accept extracurricular assignments	k. 54.9	4.1	0.7	6.5	19.4	31.7	41.7
l. Other	l. 13.3	2.2	48.5	21.2	6.1	9.1	15.1

Table I-8

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

4. Interviews with applicants are used to determine: (Please rank order with the most important ranked #1.)

	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%)							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
a. Commitment to teaching	95.3	2.8	30.2	21.9	13.2	14.9	11.6	7.4	0.4	0.4
b. Oral Skills	89.4	3.9	4.8	12.8	24.2	22.0	21.1	15.0	0.0	0.0
c. Understanding of role	85.1	3.8	10.6	14.4	19.4	18.1	20.8	14.8	1.9	0.0
d. Appearance and poise	94.5	3.6	13.3	14.6	19.2	20.8	18.3	12.9	0.8	0.0
e. Professional judgement	91.0	3.6	10.4	21.2	16.0	19.9	19.0	12.6	0.9	0.0
f. Knowledge of teaching field	92.9	2.7	32.6	21.6	15.7	11.0	5.0	8.1	0.0	0.0
g. Other	8.2	2.6	60.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
h. Other	0.8	2.0	0.0	100.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table I-9

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

5. The applicant's academic record is reviewed to determine: (Please rank order with #1 as most important.)

	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%)							
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
a. Overall grade point average	87.8	2.9	19.6	17.0	29.9	19.6	10.3	3.6	0.0	0.0
b. Grade point average in major	85.5	2.7	16.1	29.8	29.4	18.3	5.5	0.9	0.0	0.0
c. Grade point average in professional education	69.8	4.4	3.4	3.9	19.7	19.7	29.2	23.6	0.6	0.0
d. Grade point average in English, mathematics and science	66.3	4.4	1.2	6.5	17.2	22.5	33.1	19.5	0.0	0.0
e. Specific courses - whether the candidate has training in specific areas, i.e., reading, special education, multi-cultural education	93.3	2.3	42.9	25.2	8.4	11.3	8.8	3.4	0.0	0.0
f. Whether the candidate meets minimal course qualifications	83.9	2.6	30.8	32.7	10.7	8.9	5.6	11.2	0.0	0.0
g. Other	2.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table I-10

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
6. In addition to the candidates academic record, which of the following, if any, are used to assess a candidate's writing skills and abilities?	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
a. Review of application materials including short answer and/or essay	a. 175	68.6
b. Special essay written at time of interview	b. 25	9.8
c. Samples of writings/lesson plans	c. 34	13.3
d. Special examinations administered by district	d. 5	2.0
e. Other	e. 23	9.0
f. Other	f. 0	0.0

Table I-11

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
7. Does your district routinely select applicants who are certified to teach in more than one area (e.g., elementary and special education) over those prepared to teach in a single area or at a single level?	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
a. Always	26	10.2
b. Frequently	148	58.0
c. Occasionally	80	31.4
d. Never	3	1.2

Table I-12

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

III Evaluation

1. Which of the personnel identified in columns 1 through 6 evaluate the performance of those identified in lines a through i? Check all that apply.

<u>Positions Evaluated</u>	<u>EVALUATED BY</u>											
	School Board	%	Superintendent	%	Assistant Superintendent or Personnel Director	%	Principal	%	Dept. Head Supervisor or Coordinator	%	Other	%
a. Superintendent	252	98.8	40	15.7	4	1.6	15	5.9	1	0.4	1	0.4
b. Assistant or Associate Superintendents, Personnel Directors	42	16.5	130	51.0	13	5.1	5	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
c. Principals, Supervisors, Coordinators	94	36.9	220	86.3	47	18.4	30	11.8	10	3.9	7	2.7
d. Classroom teachers on continued contractual service	29	11.4	117	45.9	29	11.4	221	86.7	45	17.6	8	3.1
e. Probationary classroom teachers	29	11.4	128	50.2	32	12.5	219	85.9	45	17.6	9	3.5
f. Guidance Counselors	19	7.5	94	36.9	27	10.6	184	72.2	32	12.5	12	4.7
g. School Psychologists	9	3.5	89	34.9	29	11.4	117	45.9	37	14.5	32	12.5
h. Nurses	10	3.9	90	35.3	25	9.8	130	51.0	34	13.3	10	3.9
i. Social Workers	7	2.7	90	35.3	33	12.9	125	49.0	38	14.9	22	8.6

Table I-13

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
2. Standardized evaluation instruments are used for the following professional categories: (Check all that apply).	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
a. Superintendent	79	31.0
b. Assoc. Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent, Personnel Director	37	14.5
c. Principals, Supervisors, Coordinators	101	39.6
d. Teachers on continued contractual service	187	73.3
e. Probationary teachers	184	72.2
f. Guidance Counselors	123	48.2
g. School Psychologists	78	30.6
h. Nurses	64	25.1
i. Social Workers	79	31.0

Table I-14

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
3a. Specific written criteria are used to evaluate staff in the following categories: (Check all that apply).	Number and Percentage Responding	
	Number	%
a. Superintendent	130	51.0
b. Assoc. Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent, Personnel Director	61	23.9
c. Principals, Supervisors, Coordinators	147	57.6
d. Teachers on continued contractual service	201	78.8
e. Probationary teachers	199	78.0
f. Guidance Counselors	128	50.2
g. School Psychologists	92	36.1
h. Nurses	77	30.2
i. Social Workers	89	34.9

Table I-15, Part A

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

- 3b. Rank the following personnel in order of primary responsibility for determining written evaluation criteria, if any, for each group of educators. (1 = most responsibility)

			<u>Administrators</u>							
			Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%)					
					1	2	3	4	5	6
a. Administrative committee	a.	36.1	1.4	67.2	26.9	3.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	
b. Evaluator and evaluatee, in consultation	b.	36.1	1.8	49.3	31.9	11.6	5.8	1.4	0.0	
c. Professional organizations	c.	9.8	4.0	0.0	6.7	26.7	26.7	40.0	0.0	
d. Local Board leadership	d.	39.6	1.6	61.9	21.4	15.5	0.0	1.2	0.0	
e. Committees representing categories of personnel	e.	12.5	2.7	31.6	10.5	21.1	26.3	10.5	0.0	
f. Other	f.	2.4	2.2	60.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	

Table I-15, Part B

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

- 3b. Rank the following personnel in order of primary responsibility for determining written evaluation criteria, if any, for each group of educators. (1 = most responsibility)

						<u>Teachers</u>				
						Distribution of Rankings (%)				
				Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	1	2	3	4	5 6
a. Administrative committee	a.	40.8	1.4	71.4	21.4	4.8	2.4	0.0	0.0	
b. Evaluator and evaluatee, in consultation	b.	43.9	1.7	52.2	32.2	8.9	4.4	2.2	0.0	
c. Professional organizations	c.	9.4	3.6	10.5	5.3	36.8	10.5	36.8	0.0	
d. Local Board leadership	d.	23.9	2.6	9.8	31.4	49.0	7.8	2.0	0.0	
e. Committees representing categories of personnel	e.	23.1	2.0	50.0	25.0	9.1	11.4	4.5	0.0	
f. Other	f.	4.3	1.5	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	

Table I-15, Part C

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

3b. Rank the following personnel in order of primary responsibility for determining written evaluation criteria, if any, for each group of educators. (1 = most responsibility)

School Service Personnel

	Percentage Checking Response	Mean Rank	Distribution of Rankings (%)					
			1	2	3	4	5	6
a. Administrative committee	a. 34.1	1.4	74.4	15.4	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
b. Evaluator and evaluatee, in consultation	b. 32.9	1.7	50.7	33.3	9.3	5.3	1.3	0.0
c. Professional organizations	c. 5.9	3.7	0.0	26.7	13.3	20.0	40.0	0.0
d. Local Board leadership	d. 19.6	2.5	12.8	36.2	40.4	6.4	4.3	0.0
e. Committees representing categories of personnel	e. 13.3	1.9	59.4	12.5	12.5	12.5	3.1	0.0
f. Other	f. 2.7	1.8	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7

Table I-16, Part A

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
3b. Which of the following criteria, if any, are used to evaluate personnel in the three groups of educators? (Check all that apply.)	<u>Personnel Evaluated: Administrators</u>	
<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Number and Percentage Responding</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
a. Student performance	a. 72	28.3
b. Personal relations with peers	b. 179	70.2
c. Personal relations with parents	c. 195	76.5
d. Professional attitude	d. 215	84.3
e. Student evaluations	e. 43	16.9
f. Appearance and poise	f. 186	73.0
g. Professional competence	g. 215	84.3
h. Other	h. 12	4.7
i. Other	i. 5	2.0

Table I-16, Part B

QUESTIONS	RESPONSES	
3b. Which of the following criteria, if any, are used to evaluate personnel in the three groups of educators? (Check all that apply.)	<u>Personnel Evaluated: Teachers</u>	
<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Number and Percentage Responding</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
a. Student performance	a. 150	58.8
b. Personal relations with peers	b. 197	77.3
c. Personal relations with parents	c. 194	76.1
d. Professional attitude	d. 207	81.2
e. Student evaluations	e. 92	36.1
f. Appearance and poise	f. 182	71.4
g. Professional competence	g. 208	81.6
h. Other	h. 10	3.9
i. Other	i. 2	0.8

Table I-16, Part C

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

- 3b. Which of the following criteria, if any, are used to evaluate personnel in the three groups of educators? (Check all that apply.)

Personnel Evaluated: School Service Personnel

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Number and Percentage Responding</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
a. Student performance	a. 49	19.2
b. Personal relations with peers	b. 159	62.4
c. Personal relations with parents	c. 141	55.3
d. Professional attitude	d. 156	61.2
e. Student evaluations	e. 36	14.1
f. Appearance and poise	f. 138	54.1
g. Professional competence	g. 162	63.5
h. Other	h. 10	3.9
i. Other	i. 1	0.4

Table I-17, Part A

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

4. If the evaluation indicates that a staff member's performance is unsatisfactory, what subsequent actions are taken? (Check all that apply)	<u>Tenured Staff</u>	
	Number and Percentage	Responding
	Number	%
a. Development of a written plan for remediation	a. 234	91.8
b. Recommend or require further study at a college or university	b. 77	30.2
c. Recommend or require participation in in-service programs	c. 131	51.4
d. Scheduling of periodic conferences with supervisors or colleagues	d. 187	73.3
e. More frequent evaluations	e. 204	80.0
f. Dismissal	f. 110	43.2
g. Other	g. 8	3.1

Table I-17, Part B

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

4. If the evaluation indicates that a staff member's performance is unsatisfactory, what subsequent actions are taken? (Check all that apply)	<u>Non-Tenured Staff</u>	
	Number and Percentage	Responding
	Number	%
a. Development of a written plan for remediation	a. 203	79.6
b. Recommend or require further study at a college or university	b. 75	29.4
c. Recommend or require participation in in-service programs	c. 120	47.1
d. Scheduling of periodic conferences with supervisors or colleagues	d. 185	72.6
e. More frequent evaluations	e. 198	77.7
f. Dismissal	f. 190	74.5
g. Other	g. 5	2.0

Table I-18, Part A

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

5. Please provide the following data for staff in your district.

Teachers on Continued Contractual Services

- A. Number who left as a result of unsatisfactory performance.

Number and Percentage of DISTRICTS
Responding

Number	%	Mean
--------	---	------

1. Number dismissed in the last two years because of unsatisfactory performance (1979-80 and 1980-81)
2. Estimated number who were not dismissed but who left, in part, because of unsatisfactory performance (1979-80 and 1980-81)
3. Number granted a third year of probationary status over the last two years (1979-80 and 1980-81)

1. 27	10.6	1.5
2. 72	28.2	1.8
3. 1	0.4	1.0

Table I-18, Part B

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

5. Please provide the following data for staff in your district.

Probationary Teachers

- A. Number who left as a result of unsatisfactory performance.

Number and Percentage of DISTRICTS
Responding

Number	%	Mean
--------	---	------

1. Number dismissed in the last two years because of unsatisfactory performance (1979-80 and 1980-81)
2. Estimated number who were not dismissed but who left, in part, because of unsatisfactory performance (1979-80 and 1980-81)
3. Number granted a third year of probationary status over the last two years (1979-80 and 1980-81)

1. 101	39.6	2.6
2. 101	39.6	1.8
3. 42	16.5	25.0

Table I-18, Part C

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

5. Please provide the following data for staff in your district.

Principals

- A. Number who left as a result of unsatisfactory performance.

Number and Percentage of DISTRICTS
Responding
Number % Mean

- | | | | |
|---|-------|-----|-----|
| 1. Number dismissed in the last two years because of unsatisfactory performance (1979-80 and 1980-81) | 1. 17 | 6.7 | 1.1 |
| 2. Estimated number who were not dismissed but who left, in part, because of unsatisfactory performance (1979-80 and 1980-81) | 2. 14 | 5.5 | 1.2 |
| 3. Number granted a third year of probationary status over the last two years (1979-80 and 1980-81) | 3. 3 | 1.2 | 7.3 |

Table I-18, Part D

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

5. Please provide the following data for staff in your district.

School Service Personnel

- A. Number who left as a result of unsatisfactory performance.

Number and Percentage of DISTRICTS
Responding
Number % Mean

- | | | | |
|---|-------|------|-----|
| 1. Number dismissed in the last two years because of unsatisfactory performance (1979-80 and 1980-81) | 1. 27 | 10.6 | 3.4 |
| 2. Estimated number who were not dismissed but who left, in part, because of unsatisfactory performance (1979-80 and 1980-81) | 2. 24 | 9.4 | 1.6 |
| 3. Number granted a third year of probationary status over the last two years (1979-80 and 1980-81) | 3. 1 | 0.4 | 1.0 |

Table I-19, Part A

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

B. Number hired. How many personnel in the following categories were hired by your district in 1981-82?	<u>Inexperienced in Role Assignment</u>		
	Number	Percentage	Mean
a. Teachers	179	70.2	4.3
b. Administrators	41	16.1	1.9
c. School Service Personnel	64	25.1	1.8

Table I-19, Part B

QUESTIONS

RESPONSES

B. Number hired. How many personnel in the following categories were hired by your district in 1981-82?	<u>Experienced in Role Assignment</u>		
	Number	Percentage	Mean
a. Teachers	196	76.9	7.1
b. Administrators	48	18.8	1.8
c. School Service Personnel	54	21.2	22.3

KKM:1495h